FORMAL MEETING
READING OF THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
ROLL CALL:

| Mr. Les Andersen | present |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mr. David Zuidema | absent (arrived at 7:38 PM) |
| Mr. Richard Formicola | present |
| Mr. Nick Papapietro | present |


| Mr. Mark Divak | excused |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mr. William Placier | present |
| Mr. David Barlow | excused |
| Mr. Joseph Eliya, Alt \#1 | present |
| Mr. James Capalbo, Alt \#2 | present |

Attendance by Board Professionals: R. Wostbrock, Engineer; D. Novak, Planner; Also Present: Linda Herlihy, Esq.

Motion to appoint Linda Herlihy, Esq. of Riker Danzig, LLP as Board Attorney and approve the associated contract and resolution made by Mr. Papapietro. Seconded by Mr. Placier; all voted in favor. Atty. Herlihy confirmed she has been briefed on all current matters before the Board.

Minutes of the 8/9/23 meeting - An error was noted in the transcript that showed Mr. Yakimik as the Board Engineer and Mr. Wostbrock as the Traffic Expert. Correction to be made by Board Secretary. Motion to approve the minutes as amended made by Mr. Placier. Seconded by Mr. Capalbo; all voted in favor.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

Baumann, Ryan \& Valerie - 217 Paterson Avenue - BL 26.01 LT 13 - Atty. Bruce Rosenberg of Winne Banta on behalf of the applicant. The application is for a 120 SF , second-story dormer over an existing porch. A variance is needed because a 25 ' setback is required and 23 ' proposed; this plan will have no impact on the neighbors with regards to light, air, and open space, and is consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Zuidema arrived at 7:38 PM. Notices are in order.
Cesar Padilla, Architect - sworn in and accepted as expert. Mr. Padilla prepared the plans that were submitted with the application. The property is narrow but deep, which is typical for the street and measures $50^{\prime} \times 166^{\prime}$. The front yard setback for the existing porch is $23^{\prime}$. The proposed addition is an add-a-level on top of the porch for a bedroom that will be $8^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$. Mr. Padilla presented photos he took showing the property and neighboring properties. Exhibit A1 - photo showing the property and the house to the left which has an enclosed, covered porch and a rear addition. Exhibit A2 - photo showing the subject property and the home to the left. Exhibit A3 - photo showing the existing porch, and the alignment with the neighbor showing they are in line. Exhibit A4 - photo showing several homes across the street with setbacks estimated to be 10' or less. Exhibit A5 - photo showing a home around the corner with a porch that has an add-a-level. Mr. Padilla feels the proposed dormer would be aesthetically and architecturally consistent with the existing home and the neighborhood, and it is a modest addition that the porch will be able to hold.

The Board clarified that the addition will not extend beyond the porch; per Mr. Padilla, they are not changing the footprint at all, it will not extend beyond the porch. Mr. Papapietro asked if the porch was to remain open; Mr. Rosenberg confirmed it will and that the applicant is agreeable to a condition that it would remain open. Mr. Wostbrock questioned the bulk table as portions were blank on the plan, specifically for building
coverage and improved lot coverage. Per Mr. Wostbrock, there is also a side yard variance needed as $6^{\prime}$ is required and 5.3 ' exists, which is an existing non-conformance. Mr. Padilla reviewed the following: the front yard setback will remain 23', so a 2' variance is needed; building coverage is $20.7 \%$; improved coverage is $43.3 \%$, with a breakdown to be provided to Mr. Wostbrock.

Meeting opened to the public for questions of Mr. Padilla.
Frank Kalata - sworn in. Mr. Kalata noticed the plan was from 2016 and shows a different driveway than what is there which is a concern regarding lot coverage since he is the next-door neighbor and gets basement seepage. Mr. Padilla advised that the roof footprint and downspout locations aren't changing so there should be no increase in water.

Meeting closed to the public.
Meeting opened to the public for comments, with none, meeting closed to the public.
Mr. Papapietro questioned the survey. Atty. Herlihy advised that Mr. Berninger will have them submit an updated survey reflecting existing conditions as part of the building permit process.

Ryan Baumann, owner - sworn in. Mr. Baumann confirms that when they did the alterations to the driveway in approximately 2019, they only decreased it in the rear of the home.

The Board reviewed the variances and applicant is seeking and the conditions discussed: a 2' variance for front yard setback - 25 ' required, 23 ' existing, 23' proposed; a 0.7 ' side yard setback - $6^{\prime}$ required, $5.3^{\prime}$ existing; and a condition that the front porch is not to be enclosed. Motion to approve the application made by Mr. Formicola. Seconded by Mr. Capalbo; all voted in favor.

Jag-Tech LLC dba Midland Park Food Mart - 184 Godwin Avenue - BL 17 LT 9.01 - Applicant requested to carry to the October 11, 2023, meeting.

## MHF Midland Park LLC/Taco Bell - 80 Godwin Avenue - BL 6 LT 17.02 - see attached transcript

## COMMUNICATIONS:

2024 Meeting Dates - no issues reported with tentative meeting dates.
289 Godwin Avenue - BL 21 LT 13 - Mark Berninger Memo - Board discussed the parking issue around the address, several Members report the parking is awful and they have seen more patrons there than is supposed to be and there is a safety concern. Per Mr. Andersen, it would be up to the Mayor \& Council and Police Department to make it a "No Parking" zone.

72 Lake Avenue, LLC - 72 Lake Avenue - BL 3 LT 2 - Bergen County Planning Conditional Approval Letter and Joint Report - Information, not action taken. Per Mr. Wostbrock, they still have not addressed the Board's comments but they are in the process of changing engineers.

## RESOLUTIONS:

Granted Variances for 2022 - The Board discussed an ongoing problem with enforcement, especially of conditions of approval to make sure that whatever stipulations are made are being followed, who is responsible for checking on conditions of approvals, what the options are for enforcement and should there be a violation or fine for not following conditions of approval. Motion to approve the Annual Report for 2022 made by Mr. Papapietro. Seconded by Mr. Formicola; all voted in favor.
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nothing to worry about.
But, did you want to --
MS. HERLIHY: We'll arm wrestle.
MR. WHITAKER: You'll arm wrestle.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What we're saying
is we're not going to vote tonight.
MR. GILSON: That's his prerogative.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I just want to make
sure you understand what he's saying.
MR. WHITAKER: I do want to comment.
It's nice to see the two chairs
switched there.
Counsel?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Mr. Gilson, do you
want to enter your appearance?
MR. GILSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
Matthew Gilson from the Weiner Law Group of behalf of Burger Barn, LLC.

I'll have one witness tonight, our planner, Ms. Donna Holmqvist. And I would call her to testify, if that is the pleasure of the board.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to have three exhibits on these boards. I don't know where you would prefer the easel. I know the applicant did it over there.
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Is that the best way?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Usually we put them
over there (indicating).
And if it's at all possible, if you
could position them so that the board and the public can see them?

MS. HOLMQVIST: Okay. So is that good for everybody and the board?

Yes?
Shall I -- no.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: That's good. CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yeah, that's...
MS. HOLMQVIST: All right.
MR. GILSON: Yes.
Would you like to swear her first, or
qualify her first?
MS. HERLIHY: We will swear her in
first.
Do you swear that the testimony you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. HOLMQVIST: Yes, I do.
DONNA HOLMQVIST, PP,
110 Chestnut Ridge Road, Suite 192, Montvale, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as

## follows:

MS. HERLIHY: Thank you.
VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION
BY MR. GILSON:
Q. Ms. Holmqvist, can you please give the board the benefit of your experience?
A. Sure.

Donna Holmqvist, spelled
H-O-L-M-Q-V-I-S-T.
I'm the CEO and founder of Preferred Planning Group.

My business address is $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ Chestnut Ridge Road, Suite 192, Montvale, New Jersey.

In terms of my education, Bachelor's
degree from Rutgers University, American Studies with
Urban Planning; Master of Urban Planning from New York University.

Licensed as a Professional Planner in the State of New Jersey since 1990.

Also a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners since that time.

I'm a member of the New Jersey Planning Officials Board of Planning Advisors.

There's only 12 planners in the State of New Jersey nominated for that. I'm one of them.
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I speak regularly in Atlantic City. My
topic this year at the League of Municipalities is sober living.

I've spoken every year since I founded my firm in 2018.

I serve as the consulting planner for the Borough of Riverdale in Morris County.

I just finished a Master Plan
Re-Examination for them.
I'm also the conflict planner in
Fairfield Township, Essex County.
I've consulted for Livingston Township, also in Essex County.

And I do work on behalf of private clients all over the state.

I've been qualified before your
planning board for the Ohana Dental. We did a parking variance for them, I guess, in the last few months.

But I've testified in over 100 communities, thousands of times.

Some of my repeat clients, big names
you may know: P. F. Chang, Floor \& Decor, Trader
Joe's.
And I also represent a variety of
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institutional uses, cannabis uses. And some of my work is opposition.

MR. GILSON: Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that the board accept Ms. Holmqvist's credentials.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Your --
MR. GILSON: License is in good
standing.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Your license is currently in good standing.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Oh, absolutely, yeah.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anybody --
Mr. Whitaker, do you have anything?
MR. WHITAKER: No objection.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anyone on the board
have any questions regarding -- no?
All right. So she's accepted as an
expert in the field of municipal planning.
MR. GILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GILSON:
Q. Ms. Holmqvist, you were retained by my
client to prepare a planning overview of this site, and study?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. Can you please give the board the LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
results of your findings?
A. All right.

So we looked at the site plan,
architectural and site plan that's been filed with
the board, all the municipal reports.
We looked at your 2019 Master Plan
Re-examination.
We also evaluated the ordinance that
banned drive-through restaurants in the B-1 and B-3
districts.
We did a survey of existing land uses
in the study area. Hence my exhibits, which I'll get
to in a second.
And we're going to provide you with
facts and conclusions that, hopefully, you will see
fit to deny the application for failure to meet the
statutory proofs for a D-1 use variance.
I'm just going to go right into my presentation, if I may?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Please.
MS. HERLIHY: Why don't we mark all your exhibits, this way we won't have to interrupt you.

MR. GILSON: I believe we're on O-2.
MS. HOLMQVIST: Okay.
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## figure? That's what you want.

And should I..
MS. HERLIHY: Yes, please.
The title and the date.
MS. HOLMQVIST: And you want me to mark
the big ones, right?
Yeah, okay.
Okay. So this one is Figure 1. It's entitled "Land Use."

It's prepared by my firm. Is this O?
MR. GILSON: O-2.
MS. HOLMQVIST: O-2.
MS. HERLIHY: Is it dated or undated?
MR. GILSON: Dated 5-1-23.
MS. HERLIHY: Thank you.
(Whereupon, Figure 1, Land Use,
Prepared by Donna Holmqvist, P.P., Dated May 1, 2023 is marked as Exhibit O-2 for identification.)

MS. HOLMQVIST: The next one I'm going to be referring to is Figure 2, Zoning.

That's 5-1-23.
That's O-3?
MR. GILSON: Yes.
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(Whereupon, Figure 2, Zoning, Prepared by Donna Holmqvist, P.P., Dated May 1, 2023, is marked as Exhibit O-3 for identification.)

MS. HOLMQVIST: This one is entitled --
it's Figure 3, Adverse Impacts, 5-1-23.
MR. GILSON: O-4.
MS. HOLMQVIST: O-4.
(Whereupon, Figure 3, Adverse Impacts, Prepared by Donna Holmqvist, P.P., Dated May 1, 2023 is marked as Exhibit O-4 for identification.)

MS. HOLMQVIST: And I have a screenshot of GoogleEarth that I'm going to be talking about. Mark that O-5.
(Whereupon, GoogleEarth Street View, is marked as Exhibit O-5 for identification.)

MS. HOLMQVIST: I know the board is familiar with the site, but we've outlined it in white (indicating).

We used, as our base map, an image from
Nearmap. It's a service we subscribe to. The date of the aerial imagery is March 21st, 2023.

You can see we've color-coded the land uses very distinctly in red and yellow. Obviously
the Godwin Avenue corridor is all commercial, shown
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in red (indicating).
And the yellow to the north is the residential development primarily along Rea Avenue abutting -- abutting the site.

As you know, the property is three-and-a-half acres. It contains a CVS with a pharmacy drive-through, some other commercial uses, distinct buildings on the site.

And then we have what is the subject of this application, the vacant -- vacant bank building proposed for the Taco Bell drive-through.

On the opposite side of Godwin Avenue is an 8-and-a-half-acre property with the Midland Park Shopping Center. There's a Kings Supermarket, some other strip commercial-type uses, a Bubbakoo's, some medical-related uses and so forth. Also multiple buildings on that property.

Farther to the east, we have an office building at the corner opposite the Taco Bell site.

And then we have some fast-food
restaurants and some other business uses on the south side of Godwin east of the Midland Park Shopping Center.

I'm shifting to the Zoning exhibit,
O-3. The zoning boundaries are also shown in yellow
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
and red (indicating).
Again, commercial B-3 in the red and the R-1 to the north of the site, the residential zone district.

The proposed Taco Bell restaurant is permitted. A drive-through restaurant is not permitted in the zone. That's by Ordinance 19-21 -very clearly and distinctly prohibits drive-through restaurant use in those two zones.

The applicant is also seeking
$C$ variances, which were enumerated in the various reports. I'm just going to highlight them so the board remembers. You have a lot of information coming at you over the hearings.

The impervious coverage is excessive on the site. The applicant is reducing that exceedance very slightly. It still requires a variance. They're are about 11,000 square feet over the required impervious coverage. And that is the site in totality.

But of course they're constructing the drive-through lane, which is contributing to that.

There has also been cited an accessory structure in the front yard. That's the height clearance structure that is required for the
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every item for sale on premises.
The other notable feature --
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Can I just
interrupt for a minute? What ordinance are you referencing?

MS. HOLMQVIST: Your sign ordinance, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Sign ordinance.
MS. HOLMQVIST: Yeah.
Section 34-17.8B, the sign ordinance
that pertains to this property.
Another notable feature which could not possibly be envisioned as permitted with this sign is that the sign talks. Right?

You make an order at the menu board, and the person may talk back to you. Right?

So there's this dialogue going on. Not typical with a traditional freestanding sign for a business just highlighting the location, or maybe the address of the business, or just advertising maybe one item like coffee or, you know, something to that effect.

We don't expect freestanding signs designated in your ordinance to be talking and making noise.
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So our position -- of course, you know,
we welcome the weigh-in of your consultants, right, the borough's consultants -- but we don't believe that that menu board is permitted. Okay?

And there really has been no mention of that.

I also did not see a detail of that
sign in the plans that I reviewed.
So maybe, you know, at some point we'll
be shown that detail. So we believe that's another variance that maybe nobody was aware of.

The applicant has testified that
they're not putting any EV parking. And I guess the
borough is agreeable to that. But there is an
ordinance on your books about that.
I want to just show you, while I'm
talking about these other variances -- and I spoke of that west façade variance, right, where it doesn't
face -- the signage, where it doesn't face the street and it doesn't face a parking lot, but the applicant wants to locate signage on the west façade. So that signage would be facing eastbound traffic and pedestrians, I suppose.

But people traveling eastbound on
Godwin are what the applicant's planner testified to
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as the ones that we need that sign for.
And so that's why -- and I have looked at it myself, right.

But for the board, we have the Google view, the Google Street View.
Q. Do you have the date on which that was, the Google Street View?
A. Yeah.

It's right down -- I'm sorry.
May I pass to you? Right down on the right-hand corner from the screenshot on my computer.
I believe it says "September 12th." And so that's when we snapped that from online.
Q. No.

I'm asking what was --
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: This is O-5.
MS. HOLMQVIST: One of them was marked.
Yeah.
This gentleman has the marked one, yeah.
BY MR. GILSON:
Q. I'm actually asking when the -- when that was the street view. I know the conditions haven't changed. I'd just like the record to note that that's the date of the street view.
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A. Well, that, I don't know. But it's obviously that...
Q. October of 2021.
A. Okay. Thank you.
Q. For the record.
A. Okay.

To me it doesn't look any different.
And what I think is so notable --I hope everyone recognizes the bank building with the drive-through canopy.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I'm sorry. Can I
interrupt?
Could you just go back just a little
bit? Because I missed what you were talking about while I was looking at the photo.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Sure.
Go back?
MS. HERLIHY: I think they were discussing the date, trying to figure out what the date is.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Oh, okay.
MS. HOLMQVIST: I'm talking about the signage that is proposed on the westerly façade.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right. Okay.
MS. HOLMQVIST: And that what we
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captured for you in this Google-Street-View Image. We're looking at the west façade of the bank.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. The bank's sign.

MS. HOLMQVIST: The building.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Right.
MS. HOLMQVIST: The bank building, which is entirely visible from the street.

I don't think there's any question
about it.
So the testimony of the applicant's
planner -- and this is reflected in the transcript.
The applicant's planner testified that the close setback of other buildings on the same side of Godwin Avenue that are located to the east, block the view of the proposed building.

The proposed Taco Bell is going to be about equivalent with where the canopy is. It's entirely visible.

So I don't know -- you know, no rendering was provided by the applicant to support that conclusion.

And when I look at this picture, I
do not arrive at the same conclusion as the
applicant's planner.
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Thank you.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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So I think that's important for you to consider when you're weighing the various
$C$ variances, including the signage variance. I do not think it's needed for visibility.

Looking at O-4 entitled "Adverse
Impacts," what we did here was we took the site plan and we superimposed it to scale on the same Nearmap aerial that you've been looking at on the other exhibits.

So that would be superimposed over the
March -- March 21st, 2023 Nearmap aerial.
And this is an exact duplication of the applicant's site plan as submitted.

So you can see we colored in green some of the landscape area, I'll call it (indicating).

We're highlighting in yellow here
(indicating) where they have their refuse area.
You remember it used to be over here
(indicating) someplace near Rea, and then they moved
it to the other side of the cell tower.
This area in gray is the cell tower
(indicating).
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Could you step back one step, please?

MR. FORMICOLA: Or if you tilt it just a little bit over this way.

Sorry. Can you see?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yeah, I can
see. You were just, kind of, blocking that as you were going.

It's good.
MS. HOLMQVIST: So here we have the cell tower in gray (indicating).

I'm pointing now to the loading area
that is labeled here (indicating) "Loading Area and
Circulation Aisle." We all heard a lot of testimony on that from Mr. Dean.

We have the building here (indicating), the Taco Bell restaurant building, shaded in brown.

These blue rectangles (indicating) are
the vehicles in the queue that are shown and designated on the site plan that Mr. Dean testified to.

Around the corner is where that menu board is going to be.

And I'm going to just, kind of, highlight for you what I think are the distinct deficiencies, adverse impacts, shortcomings, things that should make this board think twice about
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have a building where the entire back of the
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granting a use variance which is subject to the enhanced standards of Medici and that you have an ordinance specifically prohibiting this use. Okay.

So I'm just going to summarize what we've replicated here visually.

This plan is contrary to the Master Plan goals of the community, entirely contrary to it.
The borough has decided that a drive-through restaurant in this zone is an incompatible use. It is not a permitted use. It's not omitted from the ordinance. It's specifically banned in this zone.

To me that's very different than
something that's just not mentioned. Okay?
Your Master Plan is from 2019. And
this ordinance is also from 2019. So they're both very recent.

The way the building is planned, we have no orientation of the building to Godwin Avenue.

When you look up and down Godwin Avenue, you see landscaping. You see restaurants on the other side of the road that have front doors facing Godwin. They have spacious landscaped areas, street trees.

We don't have any of that here. We
building, with no pedestrian doorway, is what is facing Godwin. And that is purely -- purely driven by having a drive-through at this location.

In terms of safety and traffic flow, the applicant's experts told you repeatedly, oh, it's better because we're getting rid of the bank driveway that used to empty out onto Godwin. That's safer for the pedestrians. That's a win-win. We're giving you something better.

This has a lot of issues as well that they, kind of, glossed over, okay. No bypass lane. No bypass lane. Single lane drive-throughs are not desirable, for the obvious reasons, that no one can get out of the line if there's a delay. If there's some kind of emergency, somebody can't leave.

But here we have a single-lane drive-through, creating potential issues that really you were told it's not a problem; it won't be a problem.

We also have the handicapped parking space right where I'm pointing to at the north end of the building right in front of the -- I'll call it back door, okay. They call it front door, I guess, but it's really the back door. We have the handicap space right there (indicating).
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right? Obviously people walk. They're going to the
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shopping center across the street. Maybe they're going to CVS, what-have-you.

What kind of impact do you think this continuous queue is going to have?

And I believe the testimony was that
Taco Bell drive-throughs are open 24/7. I think that's what I heard.

MR. WHITAKER: Objection.
There's no basis or foundation for the statement she just made so I want it retracted from the record.

She's now testifying to something that was not testified to.

It's going way beyond the scope of what was testified to.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Okay.
I thought there was testimony about the signage and the hours of illumination and that it was going to go past, like, 11 o'clock or whatever your ordinance.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: There was testimony to that, not what you were saying.

MR. WHITAKER: Not even close.
MS. HOLMQVIST: Okay.
So we have no pedestrian entrance to
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the sidewalk. We're going to have vehicles queued here (indicating). We're going to have the noise and the lighting effects of this illuminated menu board, which I would assume, since it's listing every item on the menu, is going to be quite large.

We're also in close proximity to the intersection here of Rea and Godwin (indicating). Mr. Dean showed you drone footage for one period on a Wednesday. I believe it was April 12th. And he focused his drone on businesses across the street, the Burger King and the Wendy's, I believe. And he did it on a Wednesday. And he did it for a very limited time period.

So why -- in his testimony he talked about he's done 50 or 60 Taco Bells in his career. Kudos to him, right. He's the Taco Bell expert.

But he didn't produce any drone footage for this corridor of existing Taco Bells so that you could see, like, what a speedy operation this is.

Instead he used something I consider totally irrelevant, because they're not Taco Bells across the street, so their menus are different. The characteristics of their clientele is probably a little different. So what relevance did that drone footage have?

And he jumped from that to tell you that the queue you saw there is what you're going to see here.

I think that's too much of a jump. I
don't think there's a supporting foundation for that, based on the record.

So I just point that out to you.
He also -- he generated the trips,
compared it to the bank.
But a board member asked, well, where are these cars going to come from? What direction are they coming from? There was no information. And there was no information because the traffic counts had not been done.

And so there was no origin and destination pattern set up to tell you where the traffic was going to come from and leave to.

So you have no idea what is going to happen at that intersection, because they didn't tell you. The applicant didn't produce an analysis of impacts and did not give you the information to discern for yourself what the impacts are.

Turning back to your Master Plan, 2019, there are three specific goals that this application is completely contrary to, okay.
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## Goal Number 1:

"Preclude incompatible nonresidential land uses. Preserve and protect residential character."

I showed you on my other exhibits the residential nature on Rea Avenue. I think you're all familiar with the neighborhood and what is your borough land use pattern.

The drive-through is an intense use in this area. Maybe that's why the governing body saw fit to address it by saying we don't want those in the B-3 District.

There was a lot of talk about, oh, we don't know why they did it. It doesn't matter why they did it. They did it. They did it and they were really clear about where it's not permitted anymore.

I don't think the menu board is
conducive to the entryway, the gateway, if you will, to a residential neighborhood.

If I were a resident on that street, I would be very concerned about the visual effect and the noise effect every time I have to drive home and I have to look at that and hear that.

Goal Number 6:
"Enhance the Godwin Avenue Commercial
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Center principal orientation toward the street conforming to the streetscape plan."

We don't have any orientation of this building to Godwin Avenue. In fact, we have the total back. The only thing that's oriented is the traffic flow for the drive-through.

Now, when I read a goal like what I just read to you, Goal Number 6, I don't think about drive-throughs all over the B-3. I think quite the opposite. We want to create an environment that's conducive to pedestrians, encourage people to be on foot as they frequent the commercial district of the borough.

And this flies right in the face of that, completely incompatible with that goal.

Goal Number 10:
"Improve safety and minimize traffic impacts, improve traffic flow, and preserve residential neighborhoods."

That's a real theme in the Master Plan, is concern about the impact of other uses on the residential neighborhoods. And when you look at the zoning map of your borough, you can well understand why. Because most of it is residential, and these residential neighborhoods abut your commercial
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districts.
So I think that's why it's reiterated through and through the Master Plan that we need to be conscious of the impacts.

As far as traffic flow, again I
highlight for you the loading area, which is there because it didn't fit anywhere else.

But the code requires a loading area to be provided.

Also, as I said before, the ADA, I
think it's obvious if this loading space is occupied, there's going to be real difficulty with visibility pulling out of that spot.

Turning to the statutory criteria. A D-1 use variance is the heaviest lift for a planner in the State of New Jersey. Okay.

And it's because of Medici and it's because of the standards of proof. And I think this failed totally.

What I took away from the applicant's planner testimony was it has to do with the lot area. They did this whole rendition of lots. They pulled in lots from the B-1, not just the B-3.

And then they said something to the effect of, well, we have three-and-a-half acres.
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And, oh, the applicant planner -- well, he referred to this area where the Taco Bell is as the finger, okay?

I don't know that I would call it the finger, but I'm going to be consistent with his testimony and that's what I'm going to refer to it as.

I would call it an appendage, but he called it the finger and said, well, that's why this is so appropriate. Look how well it fits in.

I say just the opposite. Look how it's shoehorned in. And there's an existing building there that they're demolishing. It's not like there's nothing there and we're starting with a blank slate. We're demolishing the existing building. We're constructing a new building. We're putting a drive-through, which the governing body has been really clear, no -- no good for the borough. And look how crowded.

I mean, it's so obvious. So obvious.
So the special reasons in this case
that you need to evaluate are what is so unique about this property that makes this use so particularly suited right there? Right there (indicating).

What is so incredibly unique about
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that, when we're demolishing the building that's there, when the governing body said, no, and we're shoehorning it in? You can't even get a bypass lane in there.

So I don't think there's anything
uniquely suited about this property for this use. I
think it's quite the opposite.
The applicant's planner testified about
the purposes of planning per the Municipal Land Use Law. I'm going to highlight for you out of Section 40:55d-2 Municipal Land Use Law, the purposes of planning, that this is completely contrary to, as I did say, your Master Plan.

Subsection A talks about municipal action to guide the appropriate use of land for public health, safety and welfare. This is contrary. This proposal is contrary to your ordinance prohibitions.

We have a drive-through in the front yard. It's not pedestrian friendly. The building is oriented towards the back with the entrance. And we have excessive signage and a menu board, okay, that I think is a variance.

So I don't see how that's appropriate for the public health, safety and welfare.
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Subsection I:
"Promote a desirable and visual environment."

I do not find a drive-through
loop facing Godwin, and mere feet away from pedestrians, to be promoting a desirable visual environment.

Certainly the menu board that I spoke of is not contributing to the aesthetics of the Godwin Avenue corridor.

And then, again, we have idling cars, headlights, potential exhaust fumes, depending on how long the queue is and how delayed people are.

I don't think that's conducive to
compliance with that section of the Land Use Law purpose of planning.

Denial of a drive-through for a restaurant in the B-3 does not impose a hardship on this applicant.

The proposed nonconforming use on this site is totally by virtue of the drive-through. They could have a restaurant there, but they want to have a drive-through. And they're demolishing the existing building to get it in there.

The C variances that I talked about
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
before are not related to the unique features of this building or this site. It's purely because they want to construct a drive-through. So I would submit to you that they failed on the positive criteria for this use variance. Looking at the negative criteria, no substantial detriment to the public good.

What I offer for your consideration on that prong of the negative criteria is that they haven't addressed the impacts on the surrounding area; hence, the trip generation, where is it coming from, where is it going to, what are we doing with left turns over here, we don't know. Okay?

We don't know because they didn't submit that type of analysis to you.

The substantial -- the second prong, substantial detriment to the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance, I think I enumerated quite clearly the goals in your Master Plan and how this is completely contrary.

I also talked about the Municipal Land Use Law purposes of planning. I find it to be very obvious. Your planning documents and your ordinance prohibiting this are very recent, so clearly it was
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thought about. The pedestrian environment and providing compatible uses is in multiple goals and objectives of the borough's land use plan.

And so having said all that and
presented you with visual exhibits, we hope you deny this application.
BY MR. GILSON:
Q. And, Ms. Holmqvist, I have just a few questions for you. I want to make this extremely simple.

This site exists in substantially similar condition today as it did when this ordinance banning drive-throughs in the zone was passed, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So the Council was completely cognizant of these conditions and chose to ban drive-throughs in this zone which included this location?

## A. Correct.

MR. GILSON: Thank you.
I open it up to the board for questions
of Ms. Holmqvist.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I do have
questions.
Maybe board members do too.
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But, Mr. Whitaker, did you want to do your cross before we ask questions, or don't you care?

MR. WHITAKER: It doesn't matter to me.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I have -- I
have a few questions. And this, necessarily, isn't a question, but I haven't, perhaps, articulated this very clearly in the past with the other planner.

But it's -- it's not that
drive-throughs are not permitted. Drive-throughs are permitted in this zone. What's not permitted is a restaurant with a drive-through. Okay.

So the emphasis, both by the applicant and by your testimony, to me has been on -- from your point of view, the negative aspects of the drive-through, and from the applicant's point of view, why this site is particularly suitable for a drive-through.

To me that's not the issue, whether this site is particularly suitable for a
drive-through or not
While it's all well and good, the real issue is, what are the special reasons that demonstrate that a restaurant with a drive-through advances the purposes of zoning at this site?
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If that exact same building, if we
change the name to Taco Bell Bank \& Trust, they may
not -- other than the sign and $C$ variances and the preexisting ones, they may not even need a variance.
It would be making, essentially, a site plan.
And my complaint with the applicant's
planner was that the fact that the site is
particularly suitable for a drive-through to me --
and other board members may disagree -- is not particularly informative.

What I need to know is, why does a
restaurant -- why is a restaurant drive-through so
particularly suited to this property as opposed to
a bank drive-through, or a hardware store
drive-through, or whatever?
Drive-throughs are permitted in this
zone. What the Mayor and Council -- what the
ordinance is, is that drive-throughs with a restaurant are not permitted.

So I understand what you're saying, but as part of your testimony you said, a restaurant is permitted, but a drive-through isn't.

MS. HOLMQVIST: A drive-through
restaurant.
I'm sorry. If I didn't make that
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clear, that's what I meant.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: A drive-through restaurant.

So, anyway, that's -- again, I'm not
sure I'm getting my point across, but a couple other things.

The talk -- you said that the talking
sign --
MS. HOLMQVIST: The menu board. I think I called it a talking sign, yes.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Your client is Burger King, correct?

MS. HOLMQVIST: Yes.
Burger Barn, LLC.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: They have a talking
sign.
MS. HOLMQVIST: But they're not -- they didn't ask for a variance.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. All right.
MS. HOLMQVIST: This is totally
different.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: But what you're saying -- your testimony was that it was unusual or something to that effect?

MS. HOLMQVIST: No.
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Okay. So let me just make -- clarify.
I did not make myself clear. I apologize.
What I was trying to say is, if your
sign code, when it talks about a freestanding sign, I
do not believe it contemplates a menu board that is interactive. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. Okay.
Just briefly, the -- no, I don't want
to get into that. Okay.
Anybody else have any questions for this witness?

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Just a clarification.

You made a comment about the impervious coverage being an issue. It's currently an issue now, right --

MS. HOLMQVIST: Yeah.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: -- with the current structure.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Um-hmm.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: So it's not
really going to change anything with the impervious coverage if you knock down and rebuild.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Well, they're asking
for a variance slightly less than the existing
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condition.
But I think the board should be mindful
she has a foundation basis for that. It's an opinion
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without any substantiation or foundation.
MR. GILSON: Ms. Holmqvist, have you
had experience dealing with other drive-through restaurants?

MS. HOLMQVIST: I have looked at the other ones in the borough. I've looked at the Dunkin' Donuts, the Starbucks and Burger King and Wendy's.

MR. WHITAKER: That's not experience.
That didn't answer the question.
MS. HOLMQVIST: It's an observation by a Professional Planner.

MR. GILSON: I think Ms. Holmqvist is a professional planner.

MR. WHITAKER: Ms. Holmqvist can be a professional planner and have no knowledge as it pertains to drive-through restaurants.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Mr. Whitaker, your objection is on the record. We'll let her answer the question.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, she can't answer a question with an opinion unless she's got a foundation and basis for it. I haven't heard that yet.

MR. GILSON: Ms. Holmqvist, do you have
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experience dealing with municipalities that have drive-through restaurants?

MS. HOLMQVIST: Yes.
MR. GILSON: Have you analyzed
drive-through restaurants?
MS. HOLMQVIST: A bypass is always --
MR. WHITAKER: No.
Have you -- the question was, have you
analyzed --
MR. GILSON: Mr. Whitaker, are you the applicant attorney or the applicant?

MR. WHITAKER: No.
She's got to answer the question that
you asked.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We're not going to get into a fight here.

MR. WHITAKER: It's not a fight at all. I just want the record to be established that she answers the question that's been asked.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Your objection is on the record.

MR. GILSON: I will re-ask my question.
Is It your experience as a planner that
the industry standard for drive-through restaurants is to have a bypass lane?
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MS. HOLMQVIST: Yes. CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
MR. GILSON: All right.
I reopen to the board for questions.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Does anybody else
have any questions?
MR. ELIYA: A question about the bypass
lane.
So the current bank does not have a bypass. There's two lanes, but without any bypass lane.

How does that differ from this plan here?

MS. HOLMQVIST: It's a different use.
MR. ELIYA: It's a different use, but
there's still no bypass lane.
MS. HOLMQVIST: That's correct.
But there's a lot more issues with --
and a much more intensive use with a drive-through restaurant than a bank. Okay.

The hours are different. Usually banks are not open on Sundays. Usually they close about noon on Saturday. They're not open until 11 o'clock at night. They pretty much shut down maybe 5, 6 o'clock. Okay.
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Very, very different intensity of use.

MR. DIVAK: An emergency is still an
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different intensity of use and way more spread for
hours of use with that intensity.
    Completely different than the bank
that's there, or was there.
```

It's vacant now.
MR. PLACIER: But yet, again, it's not required by law to have one?

MS. HOLMQVIST: Not to my knowledge.
MR. PLACIER: Okay.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anyone else?
MR. ELIYA: Can you just -- if you
would just mind clarifying, you mentioned something
about the study done for the other restaurants on the street.

You said they were irrelevant. If -- I mean, if they're in the same area, wouldn't you -- I would imagine that they would be fairly relevant if it's a similar traffic pattern going in a similar area.

How would those be irrelevant?
MS. HOLMQVIST: The menu items are
different, okay.
Taco Bell's menu is very different.
I don't know if there is an equal number of items on the Taco Bell menu as compared to the Burger King and
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Wendy's.
But we had a traffic engineer testify before you that said he did 50 or 60 Taco Bells. So why we didn't hear anything about Taco Bell queuing characteristics, I don't know.

MR. GILSON: Ms. Holmqvist, let me ask you this question: When the ordinance was passed banning drive-through restaurants in this zone, did those other drive-through restaurants, including the Burger King, exist?

MS. HOLMQVIST: The ones right across
the street, the Wendy's and the Burger King, yes, they existed.

MR. GILSON: So as a planner, if you were -- if you were to be advising, would you say that that was -- would be considered, in drafting an ordinance to ban further drive-through restaurants, the proliferation of current drive-through restaurants existing?

MR. WHITAKER: Objection.
MS. HERLIHY: I'm sorry.
Can you repeat that question?
MR. GILSON: Yes.
As a planner, would it be prudent to consider the current proliferation of drive-through
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restaurants?
MR. WHITAKER: Objection.
As the basis, foundation of this, that
there's a proliferation.
MR. GILSON: If there's an existing --
MR. WHITAKER: No.
MR. GILSON: If you'd like to use the word "existing." Would it be prudent to consider the existence of drive-through restaurants and whether more are appropriate in considering whether to ban further drive-through restaurants?

MR. WHITAKER: Objection to the question.

It's totally hypothetical, without basis, without foundation.

MR. GILSON: Absolutely not.
MS. HERLIHY: Not to mention that the governing body adopted the ordinance. Why they adopted it, what they considered when they adopted it, is really not a part of this application. It exists.

And this board is here dealing with the application because it exists.

So whether they adopted it because they
felt there were too many drive-throughs in town, or
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they were weren't happy with traffic, or whatever the reasons were, the ordinance exists now and we're dealing with the ordinance. I don't think it matters.

MR. GILSON: Well, we're dealing with whether this board should grant an exception to this ordinance, so I think it matters as to whether the reasons that it was considered. It's been brought up by both sides, the reasons behind the ordinance.

And I'm simply asking, as a planner, when you are drafting an ordinance to ban a certain type of use, whether or not it is appropriate to consider whether there are too many of that use existing in the zone? I think that's a fair question.

MS. HERLIHY: And even if the answer is yes, it doesn't mean that this governing body considered it when they adopted the ordinance.

MR. WHITAKER: It's irrelevant.
MR. GILSON: But I'm asking it as a general principle.

MR. WHITAKER: And what's the general principle for?

MR. GILSON: Whether, as a planner, it is appropriate or not.
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## MR. WHITAKER: It makes no sense.

 CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Again,Mr. Whitaker, I understand your objection. It's on the record.

To end this, ask your question. Have
her answer it. And we'll consider its relevance when we make a vote.

MR. GILSON: Is it an appropriate
planning standard, when designing an ordinance, to consider the current existence of uses in a zone as to whether to ban further -- that use further in the zone?

## MS. HOLMQVIST: Yes.

Zoning as well as master plan
amendments, if you will, those are fluid planning documents in a community. It's not like a community sets forth zoning standards and never changes them. Conditions change. Recognition of issues, local issues, also comes into focus.

And it's not unusual to either outlaw, if you will, or permit certain uses based on the findings.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We don't know that any of that happened, and it really doesn't matter.

For whatever reason, the governing body
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drafted this ordinance. Whether they considered all the things that you're saying, who knows. Maybe they did.

But it has nothing to do with us.
MR. GILSON: Mr. Chairman, my point was to the question as to whether other drive-throughs exist in this zone.

And my question then goes to that was considered in the ordinance and whether you should continue to grant a variance.

MR. WHITAKER: We don't know.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We don't know and we don't care. We have an ordinance that's presumed to be valid.

MR. GILSON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We're not here to
question whether the Mayor and Council know what they're doing, or why they did it, or whether it's a good ordinance or a bad ordinance. It's an ordinance.

Why they did it -- unless I'm
misunderstanding your point.
MR. GILSON: My point was more that the current drive-throughs in the zone, they don't matter as to this ordinance.
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CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: To me -- you were
here for -- and again, I'm only speaking for myself, not for the board.

The most important thing is the
legislative history of the ordinance is that the Dunkin' Donuts application came here because our zoning officer concluded that our old ordinance required a use variance for a drive-through.

When it came here, we questioned whether they really needed a use variance. Our board attorney, the planning board attorney, the borough attorney conferred. And they all agreed that the ordinance then in effect did not require a use variance for a drive-through for the Dunkin' Donuts.

Within months after that, the Mayor and Council drafted this ordinance saying no drive-through restaurants allowed.

To me -- again I'm only speaking for myself. To me, that's the important part of it, is it's clear -- again to me -- that the Mayor and Council made it crystal-clear they don't want any more drive-through restaurants.

MR. GILSON: And I couldn't agree with you more.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Well, I'm sure.
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immaterial.
            Anyway, all right. I'm sorry.
        Go ahead.
        MR. GILSON: Questions of the board.
        CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Before we get to
David, questions.
    Mr. Whitaker, I'm going to ask our
planner, or do you want to do your cross?
            I just want to steal your thunder.
            MR. WHITAKER: I don't have thunder,
but I think I'll ask my questions now.
                            CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You can wait,
right?
            MR. NOVAK: I can wait, yeah.
CROSS-EXAMINATION
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. Ms. Holmqvist, who is it that you represent?
A. Burger Barn, LLC.
Q. And have you attended the meetings of March the 8th, April the 17 th, July 12th and August 9th?
A. I believe I was here for all those.
Q. You believe you were or were there?
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A. I was here from the beginning of the application.
Q. You were here at the March 8th meeting, the presentation made by the Taco Bell
representatives?
A. No.
Q. I didn't see you in the audience.
A. No.
Q. Were you here on April the 17th?
A. What was the testimony then?
Q. I don't know.

You tell me, if you remember it?
A. I didn't -- I did not record all the
meetings that I attended.
Q. Okay. Did you read all the
transcripts?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you have the transcripts, and have you read them?

You're under oath.
A. Most of them.
Q. Most of them.

Which ones did you read?
A. I was here for the applicant's planner testimony.
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## Isn't that the most relevant?

Q. No.

You're going to answer my questions.
You're going to answer my questions and not try to
answer the question with something you want to say.
Those are the rules. Okay?
So you weren't here in March. You weren't here in April.

So the things you're opining about,
Taco Bell and the menu and things that were explained at those meetings, you didn't have a transcript to read and you never heard the testimony?
A. I heard the architect's testimony, your traffic engineer, your site engineer.

And those are the most relevant --
Q. But not tonight if you're talking about
menu and you're talking about other things about Taco Bell.

So you missed that meeting?
A. I didn't see any detail of the menu board.
Q. That's your decision.
A. I reviewed the plans that are posted on the website --
Q. So you didn't hear --
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A. -- and I did not see a menu board detail.
Q. That's not what I've asked you.

You didn't hear the testimony of the March 8th meeting?
A. It wouldn't change my testimony.
Q. You wouldn't know that because you don't know what the testimony was on the March 8th meeting.
A. I know what the facts are based on the plan that's been submitted to this board, and the applicant's professional witnesses, that being the site engineer, the traffic engineer and the planner.
Q. So I'm going to say right now, you did not hear all of the testimony from all of the witnesses that presented the case, correct; yes or no?
A. I don't recall.
Q. You don't recall.
A. I don't remember.
Q. So you don't remember if you were in this room on March the 8th?
A. My position --
Q. No.

I asked the question. Answer it.
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MR. GILSON: Objection.
She's already answered this question. CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: She has? MR. WHITAKER: She has? Because I haven't heard it.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What was the answer? Was she here or wasn't she?

MR. WHITAKER: Yeah.
How hard is that? And that's just the beginning.

MS. HOLMQVIST: I was here on
July 12th. And I believe there was a June meeting.
MR. WHITAKER: Let the record reflect that the witness has to look at her notes to determine when she has been here.

MS. HOLMQVIST: I'm here to give an opinion.
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. No. I asked you the question. You haven't been able to answer it yet.
A. No, you're right, I haven't.
Q. Thank you.

Ms. Holmqvist, have you met the principals of Burger Barn, LLC?
A. No.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
Q. Have you had the ability to discuss with any of the members of the Burger Barn their concerns or their issues pertaining to this application?
A. I have worked with Mr. Gilson's office.
Q. So -- and Mr. Gilson is who?
A. The ap -- the objectors' counsel.
Q. So it would be correct to say that the concern being raised by your client -- and your client is really Burger Barn, LLC, correct?
A. Burger Barn LLC.
Q. Okay.

So it would be correct to say that any
concerns that Burger Barn, LLC has, the only way you know about them, if any at all, is through the attorney?
A. I was asked to do --
Q. No. It's a yes or no.
A. -- an assessment of whether --
(Simultaneous Speaking.)
Q. No. It's a yes or no.
A. -- of whether.
Q. No, no, you're not going to --
A. The testimony and the evidence --

MR. GILSON: Objection.
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MR. WHITAKER: She can't answer the question with what she wants to say. I'm asking if I have a Bergen Barn, LLC has raised.

MS. HERLIHY: It's Burger Barn.
MR. WHITAKER: Burger Barn has raised
-- has become an objector. And I'm asking if this
planner has discussed what the applicant's concerns were with this application.

That's a fair question.
MS. HOLMQVIST: Well, we don't know what the impacts are to the intersection.

MR. WHITAKER: I asked if she spoke to any of the principals.

MS. HERLIHY: I'm not sure --
MS. HOLMQVIST: The concerns were relayed to me by counsel.

MS. HERLIHY: I'm not sure it's
relevant whether she spoke to the applicant or the applicant's attorney, who is -- or the objectors' attorney, who is -- who is the representative or agent.

But nonetheless, you should answer the question.

MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.
BY MR. WHITAKER:
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Q. Can we answer the question?
A. I have been advised by Mr. Gilson and his office of what my charge is.
Q. My question was just merely a yes or a no. Can we get a no?

You didn't speak with the principals?
A. The question is: Did I speak with the principal of Burger Barn, LLC?
Q. Correct.
A. No.
Q. Okay. In the analysis that you've done
as a planner, did you review this with any civil engineer?
A. Did I review my --
Q. The plans, yes.
A. -- analysis with a civil engineer?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Did you review it with any traffic engineer?
A. No. I've been a planner for --
Q. No. I don't care how long you've been a planner.
A. -- $\mathbf{3 7}$ years, Mr. Whitaker.
Q. I don't ask -- I'm not asking how long
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you're been a planner.

## A. I don't understand the question.

MR. WHITAKER: Because I want to get --
I want to get to the basis of how she's based her
foundation and basis of the opinion that she's
already given. I just want to know if she's had any
input. I have the right to ask. I've already found
out -- just putting this on the record. I found out
she's never talked to the principals of the objector, other than through counsel. Okay?

I have at this point found out that she
hasn't, in doing her analysis, relied on anybody
else's expert opinion. She's talked and commented
about traffic, about queuing and things like that.
But she's a planner.
MS. HERLIHY: She acknowledged that she
hasn't met with or discussed with those that you specifically asked her about.

MR. WHITAKER: Correct.
MS. HERLIHY: You did not ask her if
she's met with or discussed with any other
professionals.
So you can't exclude all of them.
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. My next question: Other than counsel LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
for the applicant, have you discussed this and reviewed this application with anyone else?
A. No.
Q. Have you been to the site?
A. Many times.
Q. And when you were at the site, did you
observe any congestion of the cars, automobiles and
motor vehicles on the -- on the shopping center, itself?
A. No.
Q. Have you been to your client's site?
A. Yes.
Q. Does your client's site have a
drive-through?
A. Yes.
Q. Does your client's site have a reader
board?
A. There is a menu board.

Is that what you mean reader board?
Q. Menu board, reader board.
A. Yes.
Q. Interchangeable?
A. It also has a bypass lane.
Q. I didn't ask that, did I?
A. No.
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MR. WHITAKER: Can I ask and direct
that the witness answer the question that I ask and not opine on other things.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You can ask that.
MR. WHITAKER: I mean, honestly.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: What do you want us
to do?
MR. WHITAKER: I want you to not
admonish her, but direct her to answer only the question I ask.

Is that hard?
MS. HERLIHY: Please try to limit your answers --

MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.
MS. HERLIHY: -- to the question at
hand.
And your counsel will then have the
opportunity to redirect and expound upon any of the questions that he feels that he wants to after
Mr. Whitaker is done.
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. That menu board that's there on your client's property, do you know how they got an approval for that?

## A. No.
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Q. If I work on the theory that menu boards are not permitted in Midland Park, by virtue of their ordinances, I would assume then that the Burger King menu board would be illegal?

MR. GILSON: Mr. Chairman, I object to this, as we're considering the merits of this application, not of any previously approved applications for any of the other restaurants.

MR. WHITAKER: She's told me I need a
variance for a menu board, so I can certainly go through and show why.

MS. HERLIHY: First of all, we're not in court.

Everybody, calm down.
They have leeway. There is leeway here to ask questions, give answers.

You asked questions about, you know, considering whether the Mayor and Council considered the -- he's not out of line yet.

MR. WHITAKER: She brought it up, not
I.

BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. The menu board at Wendy's, the menu board at Burger King --
A. What did I bring up?
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Q. Menu board -- I'm saying it. At Dunkin' Donuts. And a menu board --
A. What did I bring up, though?
Q. And a menu board exists at Starbucks.

So your opinion is that the ordinance doesn't permit any menu boards in Midland Park, correct?
A. That's my interpretation.

But you have the borough planner here, you should ask him.

MR. WHITAKER: Are we going to continue
that way, or is she going to answer my question?
MS. HOLMQVIST: The Borough planner
is here.
MR. WHITAKER: I'm building a record.
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. How often have you been to your client's site?
A. As many times as I've been to your client's site.
Q. And how many times was that?
A. I would say about five.
Q. And have you observed the motor vehicles that queue on your client's site?
A. There really hasn't been a queue.

I would say I've observed maybe three
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cars the times I've been at my client's site.
Q. The queuing and the ingress and egress on your client's site, do they come in off of Godwin Avenue and go out of Godwin Avenue?
A. There are driveways on Godwin, correct.
Q. Both the entry and the exit?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever observed the Wendy's
facility?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know how they exit and enter?
A. On Godwin.

On -- from Godwin.
Q. And from what you have seen at your
client's site, would it be correct to say that the
drive-through is operational and works, from a planning perspective?
A. There's a bypass there. I haven't observed a large queue. And there's plenty of surface parking as well.
Q. So we have an ordinance in place now that says that no drive-throughs for a restaurant are permitted. That's what we're dealing with?
A. Yes.
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And I don't have that information.
Q. So let's just say that the Burger King LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
Q. So I just would like to throw out a hypothetical to you, just something I thought of.

You know as a planner that what you
have at Burger King right now, based on this ordinance, would be a nonconforming use, correct, the drive-through restaurant?
A. If we were demolishing the building the way you're doing, and somebody wanted to build a Burger King with a drive-through, is this the hypothetical?
Q. No.
A. We're wiping the slate clean the way you are.
Q. I was going to use the hypothetical of this, okay? The Burger King has a fire. More than 50 percent of the building is destroyed. Now, you know under the planning concept that nonconformity goes away, correct?
A. I don't know what approvals were given.
Q. I didn't ask that question.
A. I haven't seen --
Q. Here we go again.
A. Well, it does matter. It does matter.
got built before 2021 when the ordinance was changed.
Would that make it a nonconforming use, from a
planning perspective?
A. If it was existing? Let's talk, like,
if it was built in the 1960s or '50s. I don't know what we're doing hypothetically here.
Q. It was built before 19 -- before 2021.

MS. HERLIHY: The ordinance in question
that prohibits a drive-through restaurant was adopted in 2021.

So any drive-through restaurant in those two zones that exist as of the day the ordinance was adopted are preexisting, nonconforming uses, which may continue unchanged. You can't expand them.

As Mr. Whitaker says if they are abandoned in some way, which potentially 50 -- I'm not sure if 50 percent, I don't know if we have an ordinance that has a different number.

MR. WHITAKER: Well, it's case law that
says --
MS. HERLIHY: Potentially he's getting
-- that's his point, I believe. I don't want to put
words in his mouth. But that is a preexisting
nonconforming use by virtue of the ordinance that now
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outlaws drive-through restaurants, such as the existing Burger King, the existing Wendy's.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Okay. I have not
looked at --
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. With that hypothetical -- let's trust what Ms. Herlihy has said as being factual, that it was built before 2021, and it's a nonconforming use, and it now gets destroyed by fire, by mayhem, or whatever. And the applicant comes to you and would want to rebuild it there. You would have to seek what type of a variance at that point?
A. That would be a D variance.
Q. Right.

And you would be seeking the type of variance for a restaurant with a drive-through, correct?

## A. If they wanted to build a

drive-through, yes.
Q. And let's assume they wanted to. Could you, from a planning perspective, support that application there?
A. I would have to look closely at that. I can't just render an opinion.
Q. So you wouldn't have an opinion as to LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
whether that could be done?
MR. GILSON: Objection.
Mr. Whitaker's entire testimony was
that there are special reasons why his property qualifies.

MR. WHITAKER: I haven't gotten there
yet.
MR. GILSON: Those special reasons can very well apply to the Burger King.

As such, I think it's inappropriate
that we continue down this path of discussing the
Burger King property, which is not the subject of this application.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Where are you going
with this?
MR. WHITAKER: I'm just asking -- just
asking to show that -- and I'm building the case, and
you'll hear from me more about this -- is that this
ordinance could create a situation where you don't
have drive-throughs in the town whatsoever.
I'll get there. Not with this witness.
MS. HERLIHY: Drive-through
restaurants.
MR. WHITAKER: Drive-through
restaurants.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.

## the parking lot --
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Q. I didn't ask that question.
A. -- not on Godwin Avenue --
Q. Strike the answer.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Ask that question.
She's a planner and she's giving her planning testimony.

MR. WHITAKER: I didn't ask her as a planner. I asked her if the ordinance requires it. BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. Now, as a planner, you've stated that you've represented certain municipalities in doing ordinances for them?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And you know the procedure on the Municipal Land Use Law for creating a land use ordinance or modifying a land use ordinance?
A. Yes.
Q. And in your capacity as a planner in
your 30-plus years of doing this work, have you been called upon to give advice as a planner for the creation of an ordinance or for the modification of an ordinance?
A. Yes. I've been asked to draft
ordinances.
Q. Okay.
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A. Or amendments thereto.
Q. And when you draft those ordinances, in many instances would it be correct -- correct me if I'm wrong -- as a planner, you give the pros and the cons of the reasons why an ordinance should be created?
A. The pros and the cons?

Sometimes the local officials have
already recognized issues and they want the ordinance drafted to permit or prohibit.
Q. So you follow those type of instructions and those type of --
A. Yeah.

If I saw something of concern, I would
certainly point it out.
Q. And many times those type of concerns are listed in the ordinance in the preamble?
A. Sometimes. It can be. It can be.

It's not mandatory, though.
Q. I didn't say that. I said sometimes.

Okay.
And that ordinance first starts, as I
understand it, with the introduction by the Mayor and Council, correct?
A. Yes.
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Q. And then what happens next after that?
A. Then it's referred to the planning
board for consistency review with the master plan.
Q. And they have 35 days to do that, don't they?
A. I believe that's correct.
Q. Okay. And what is it that they have to do after they've had that consistency review; what do they do?
A. Well, they look at their master plan.

And at that point, they may refer it to the board planner to give an opinion on consistency. I've been asked to do that many times.
Q. And what do you do when you've been asked to do that?
A. I'll usually do a written memorandum to the planning board, giving the opinion on whether the proposed ordinance is consistent or inconsistent with the master plan.

And then the planning board will review
that, and they'll make a recommendation to the governing body.
Q. And when they send that back to the governing body, would it be correct that many times they'll also send with that your memorandum or the
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opinion you've given?
A. Not always.

Sometimes it's not referred to the
planner. It's really at the discretion of the local officials.
Q. As a planner, if they've relied upon you to do something like this and you've given a memorandum, they discuss it, they review it?
A. I would hope.
Q. Okay. And then what happens?

The planning board makes that response
back to the Mayor and Council hopefully within the 35 days?
A. Right.

And it's strictly whether it's
consistent or inconsistent with the master plan.
Q. And then at that point an ordinance would be adopted?
A. Right.

Published and so forth.
Q. Thank you.

You weren't here for the testimony,
we've established that, of our first witness, Ever
Santana? You don't know that name, do you?
A. No.
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Q. So let me just back up a little bit and tell you that he's the Manager of Operations for this applicant. And he testified as to the hours of operation. He testified as to the number of employees.

You're familiar with that type of testimony that a manager of an operations would give?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But you didn't hear that or -because you opine on a couple things tonight. But you didn't hear that testimony of Mr. Santana?
A. No, no.
Q. Okay. So you didn't hear the testimony of him in which he stated that industry-wide post-pandemic -- it's in the transcript that you haven't read -- 75 percent of the customers now use a drive-through or DoorDash for a --
A. Taco Bell.
Q. No. For fast-food-style restaurants.
A. Okay, $\mathbf{7 5}$ percent of fast-food customers no matter what restaurant it is?
Q. Taco Bell, Burger King, Wendy's, fast food, okay? That's what he testified to. That's news to you? He calls that a QSR, quick-service restaurant.
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You've heard that term?
A. It could be even higher. Because in Livingston I worked on a Starbucks, and there was upwards of $\mathbf{7 5}, 85$ percent was predicted to come through the drive-through.
Q. So if I had 85 percent going through a drive-through at a facility, just hypothetically here -- and that's been established that it's an industry standard, 75,85 percent -- and I didn't have a drive-through at a facility, probably that business would not be very viable, correct, a QSR?
A. If the restaurant wanted a drive-through and that was imperative to their business plan, this would not be a good site because it's not permitted.
Q. Okay. So, effectively, by the
establishment of -- a prohibition of a drive-through for a QSR, effectively realistically, based upon this 85 or 75 percent factor, basically prohibiting quick-service restaurants in Midland Park?
A. You know, in the B-1 and the B-3. But I don't know about the other zones in the Borough.
Q. Right.
A. But in the B-1 and the B-3 perhaps, LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 would it be correct to say that a facility, a QSR, that has the ability not to immediately take traffic
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yeah.
Q. Did you look at the -- at the list of properties that are in the $\mathrm{B}-1$ and the $\mathrm{B}-3$ and the --
A. No.
(Simultaneous Speaking.)
Q. -- comparison of the size of the other QSRs in Midland Park and what is being proposed here?
A. That was produced by your planner.
Q. Yes. Did you review that?
A. I did look at it, yeah.
Q. Okay. And do you agree with him that
he testified that in a couple instances this piece of property is seven times bigger than where the Dunkin' Donuts is, for instance?
A. Yeah.

I believe the Dunkin' Donuts and the Starbucks are about a little -- 28,000, 20,000, something like that, square feet.

I'm going off my memory. This site, the entirety of it is three-and-a-half acres.
Q. Three-and-a-half acres?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. From a planning perspective,

in from a heavily trafficked road like Godwin Avenue but can take the traffic in internally and also dispel the traffic in a drive-through facility?
A. Can I just -- I want to understand what you're saying. Okay?

When you say take the traffic in, are we talking about from the parking lot?
Q. Yeah. Taking traffic from a parking
lot rather than having it come directly in from the street.
A. So having the restaurant here, you're saying?
Q. Not this specific one.
A. Okay. We're not talking about this site.
Q. I'm just saying that from a planning perspective, if there's some attributes to having entrance and exiting of a QSR occur internally, rather than on a heavily trafficked road?
A. I think that's for your traffic engineer. I -- no.
Q. So you don't know?
A. It's not that I don't know. I don't think that's a planning question.
Q. Okay.
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A. I don't think that's a planning question.
Q. Fair enough. Okay. It's beyond your expertise. I respect that.
A. Every site is unique. And you just told me we're not talking about this site, so I don't know what site we're talking about.

So I'm not comfortable giving an opinion on a site I don't know about.
Q. I was talking about an overview
planning concept, if you had an opinion as to whether taking traffic of a county road into a -- into a facility versus queuing off a county road, like your client does right now, which would be better.

But you don't have an opinion on that.
I respect that.
MR. WHITAKER: Just a few more,
Mr. Chairman.
Bear with me.
BY MR. WHITAKER:
Q. You stated that we are seeking a variance for impervious coverage.

## A. Yes.

Q. But as one of the members of the board
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said, you do recognize that the amount of impervious coverage is going to be reduced versus what's there now?
A. A slight reduction.
Q. Okay.

From a planning perspective --
A. Let me just clarify. It's permitted at
75. I believe it's existing 83.6 and proposed as
82.6, correct, yeah.
Q. Right.

So any time you can reduce impervious
coverage, from a planning perspective, no matter how small it may be, does that constitute a positive from a planning perspective?

Just a yes or no?
A. It's de minimis, in my opinion.
Q. I said even if it's de minimis.
A. It's de minimus.
Q. But is it a positive or is it a
negative?
A. It's de minimis.
Q. Okay. We don't want to answer the question. I understand.

You talked about a bypass lane. And you made a comment that it's based on an industry
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standard or whatever.
Do you have a treatise or anything you can tell me where you read that?
A. Three out of the four fast-food restaurants, I'll say, in the borough have bypass lane.
Q. But that wasn't my question.
A. That's my answer.
Q. That's the only answer you can give?
A. That's my answer.
Q. Because you don't really have a basis or foundation for knowing that on a national level?
A. It certainly would be safer to have a bypass lane.
Q. You still don't answer my question.

Were you here for the testimony from Mr. Missey, probably the second meeting --
A. I was here for Mr. Missey.
Q. -- when he testified about the fencing that would be put along Godwin to eliminate light pollution and the headlights facing Godwin, and the bollards that would be put in; do you recall that testimony?
A. The bollards? It's board-on-board fence we're talking about right here along Godwin LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

## (indicating).

Q. And bollards --
A. But I believe there's a break in the
fence. Am I correct?
There's a break in the fence. It's not a solid continuous fence.
Q. I believe it's a solid fence. And it
can be if the board sees that that's got to be a condition of approval.

You also made a comment that you were not aware of what -- let me look at what you said, because I wrote it down. You weren't sure of what the characteristics of a Taco Bell are different from a Burger King.

What did you mean by that?
A. It's a different type of food. They're not cooking burgers. I don't -- I don't frequent fast food so...

But, no, it's different. Different
menu items. Totally different.
Q. But it's still a QSR?
A. Yes.
Q. I didn't know if you were trying to
distinguish Taco Bell from an American hamburger, other than it's a different food.
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A. I prefer a burger.

MR. WHITAKER: Mr. Chairman, I have no
further questions at this time.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Mr. Gilson, do you have redirect?

MR. GILSON: Very brief.
I'm going to keep this simple because
we got a lot of information coming back and forth.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. GILSON:
Q. The Council passed an ordinance banning drive-through restaurant in this zone, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. The conditions at this site exist substantially similar today as they did on that date?
A. Yes.
Q. And it is your professional planning opinion the applicant has provided no testimony to support the -- insufficient testimony to support special reasons for the granting of a D variance?
A. That's my opinion, yes.

MR. GILSON: No further questions.
MS. HERLIHY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: David or board, does anybody have -- let's hear from David.
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MR. NOVAK: Just questions for this time.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. For the witness?

Actually, anything you have to offer would be appreciated.

MR. NOVAK: I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anything you have
to offer would be appreciated.
MR. NOVAK: Oh, thank you.
Thank you.
I know the board might have some questions for me. I don't know if it will be tonight or the next hearing, but not to beat a dead horse, because we've heard a lot of testimony and a lot -- a lot of cross-examination.

Can you just -- can you just discuss
the negative criteria a little bit more?
When we talk about no substantial
detriment to the public good and no substantial impairment to the intent of the zone plan, how does that relate to the ordinance that was adopted by the Council, and specifically harping on the Chairman's question that the ordinance was really directed towards fast food -- I'm sorry -- restaurants with
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drive-throughs, not drive-throughs in general, but drive-through restaurants?

If you can just focus on the negative criteria of that. Really open it up for more of a broader perspective as opposed to looking at the specifics of each thing.

MS. HOLMQVIST: Okay.
So the first prong of the negative criteria is no substantial detriment to the public good. Okay?

And the opinions that I'm offering for
the board to consider is that this applicant has not really discussed the impacts to the surrounding residential area or the pedestrians along Godwin Avenue.

There's what I consider to be a limited traffic analysis. Again, no identification of level of service at the intersection. No analysis of turning movements at the intersection. And no origin destination information, where is traffic coming from to arrive at the site, where it's leaving to, and what are the turning movements related to that.

The Master Plan talks a lot about
compatibility with residential areas.
As a planner, yes, we have an office
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opposite us. We have a defunct bank, vacant bank, here.

But this really is the entryway to a
residential neighborhood once you -- once you leave Godwin.

Talking about substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the --

MS. HERLIHY: I'm sorry.
Before you do that, back to the adverse
impacts, so it's your opinion that those adverse impacts that you just described are specific to the fact that this is a drive-through restaurant as opposed to just the drive-through aspect, itself?

In other words, if they were -- as the Chairman has said, if they were proposing a drive-through bank with the very same layout, the very same queue, would you have the same issues or the same adverse impacts?

So it's not necessarily related to the
fact that it's a drive-through for the restaurant?
It's a question not -- it doesn't sound like it's coming out as a question.

MS. HOLMQVIST: I do think I understand what you're deriving. Correct me if I have not.

I mentioned during my testimony the
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intensity of the use and how Mr. Whitaker corrected me about the hours of operation.

But I think he would agree, they're going to have greater operating hours than a bank that was previously there. The ordering does not occur at a bank. Okay? You're conducting transactions, financial transactions. Maybe you have a question, but it's not going to be on the order of waiting on line and having people ask questions about menu items.

Then I left out the delay of deciding amongst the people in the car who is getting what, right, or changing the order.

So it's a more intense use. The characteristics of the use are very different on top of that. I think that's what you're trying to get at. Yeah.

So I'll go on to the second prong.
Yeah?
The substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the zone plan. I believe that this application as presented fails to satisfy the negative criteria for these reasons. You have a recent master plan that I enumerated the goals that talk about preserving residential neighborhoods. And

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
this is completely contrary to that.
It also talks about streetscape, pedestrian environment, for Godwin Avenue. This introduces a situation where we have the back of the building further exacerbated by the drive-through lane. I mean, I think it's concerning enough that the building back faces Godwin, which is a shopping area someplace with sidewalks where people obviously walk to visit local businesses. It's certainly within walking distance of the residential neighborhood to the north. And yet we have something -- a design completely contrary. And that contrary design is totally driven by having the drive-through lane because obviously they're not going to put a front door where you have to cross the queue of vehicles waiting to order.

That's my response to your planner, unless he wants to follow up on that.

MR. NOVAK: That's all I have for now.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That's all you have? Okay.

You're finished?
MR. GILSON: Yes.
Unless -- yeah.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. We're going to open to the public.

MR. GILSON: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Motion to open to the public.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Motion to
open to the public.
MR. GILSON: This is opening for questions of Ms. Holmqvist.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
MR. FORMICOLA: Second.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Capalbo?
MR. CAPALBO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Okay. I see
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some people here who haven't been here before, so I'll explain this once again.

The public is afforded a number of opportunities to address the board. Right now we're opening the meeting to the public to ask questions only of this witness.

At the end of the application, when everything is -- all the evidence is in and everything else, there will be an opportunity for members of the public to address the board to say whatever you want about it, whether you like it, you don't like it. It's whatever. You don't -- just tell us what you think.

But for right now, all we want is
questions of this witness, either something you didn't understand or something that you want to hear that she didn't say or whatever.

So does anybody in the public have a question for this witness?
(No Response.)
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Seeing none -seeing none?

Is there anyone behind Mr. Gilson? Okay.

## Motion to close?
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MR. FORMICOLA: Motion.
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Second.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Capalbo?
MR. CAPALBO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. All right.
Do you have anything else tonight?
MR. GILSON: I have nothing further.
In summation, I would just like to say,
as I've said many times, this ordinance was passed.
This site existed the way it currently does. And
there has been, now supported by our expert
testimony, insufficient special reasons to grant a
variance from that ordinance.
With that, Mr. Chairman, thank you for
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your time.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
And, Mr. Whitaker, you've already told
us that you're not giving your summation tonight?
MR. WHITAKER: I couldn't give my
summation until I hear from the public except -- and digest what I've heard this evening. And I have some questions of your planner also.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Do you want to do that now?

MR. WHITAKER: Just a couple questions, just so I can get it clarified.

When I look at this ordinance that came about in 2021, 19-21, in looking at the definitions, it prohibits a drive-through restaurant. But you've seen what -- correct me if I'm wrong -- what the definition of a drive-through restaurant is. It doesn't mean I need to have a window, correct?

MR. NOVAK: The reason I'm pausing is that I'm reading the definition of the drive-through restaurant in the ordinance, which I will read out loud.
"An establishment in which food or drink is served to customers with the automobiles outside the confines of the
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building and where the consumption of such food or drink is intended to occur off the premises."

MR. WHITAKER: So if I have a restaurant in the B-1 or B-3 Zone, and I pull up. I don't have a drive-through window. I pull into a parking space. And the owner comes out and hands me my bag of food.

That's prohibited by that definition of drive-through?

MR. NOVAK: I would tend to agree. It doesn't necessarily --

MR. WHITAKER: Very prevalent during
the timeframe of COVID.
MR. NOVAK: I was thinking more of a
Sonic type of design so...
MR. WHITAKER: But it could be -- you
know, if Auturo's was in the zone and I had --
couldn't get out of the car, as a matter of courtesy they wanted to bring it out to me in the rain under and umbrella, they really are prevented from doing it based on the ordinance that was passed, correct?

MR. NOVAK: Based on that definition of drive-through restaurant, I would agree that it's fairly broad in its term. It does not specify that
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to then prohibit what's called a drive-through restaurant?

MR. NOVAK: That is correct.
MR. WHITAKER: Thank you.
Members of the public.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay. I don't know
exactly where you're going with this.
MR. WHITAKER: You'll find out.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I mean, I know you
know this, but we're obviously not in the position to judge whether the ordinance is well-drafted or not, or whether the Mayor and Council should have done something else.

MR. WHITAKER: I'm not suggesting that. I am not picking on the Mayor and Council, okay? I started my opening in March -- Ms. Holmqvist missed it -- by saying that there was some very different approaches to drive-throughs that made this unique. And I'm going to be talking to you about, in essence, this was never thought of when the ordinance was passed. And that's something you can consider, because that can make it particularly suited. That's all I'm giving away tonight.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right.
So, Mr. Whitaker, we're agreed that
your case is complete?
MR. WHITAKER: The case is concluded.
Just summation.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: So now before we
open this to the public for comments, does anybody on
the board have anything to say?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Just a comment for the next meeting, or before the next meeting, because this has gone on for -- since March.

Here we are going to be in September, maybe October. That's right, we'll be in October. Can we get a current write-up of again what they're looking for again and, like, a summation and an updated version of that? Because it's been going on so long.

I have a lot of notes but it would help to have it consolidated.

MR. WHITAKER: The answer is yes.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: I'm sure
Mr. Whitaker will tell us the C variances he needs and everything else.

MR. WHITAKER: I'll provide an outline before the hearing.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: And I never gave
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you an opportunity, Rich. I didn't think you would have anything about planning but...

MR. WOSTBROCK: I let Dave talk about the planning.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right.
So, that being the case, do we have a
motion to open it to the public for comments.
MR. FORMICOLA: I'll make a motion to open it up to the public for comments.

MR. ZUIDEMA: Second.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Capalbo?
MR. CAPALBO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes. Okay.
Anybody in the public who wants to make
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the board aware of anything regarding this application?

MS. ROSSO: I do.
Can this be comments? This is comments

## first?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: One of you go.
MS. ROSSO: Okay.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You have to come
up.
MS. ROSSO: Okay. I have to come up?
I've never been to one of these
meetings. It's very cold in here. It's very long.
MS. HERLIHY: We need your name and your address.

MS. ROSSO: Okay.
That actually I have to read because I wrote a bunch of stuff down. I didn't want to forget anything.

My name is Helene Rosso.
I live 32 Susan Ave in Midland Park.
MS. HERLIHY: And you're going to give comments. We need to swear you in.

You need to raise your right hand.
MS. ROSSO: Wait.
I have to -- okay.
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MS. HERLIHY: Because you're not just asking questions; you're giving comments for the board.

MS. ROSSO: I'm going to give comments, yeah.

MS. HERLIHY: Do you swear that the testimony you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. ROSSO: I do.
HELENE ROSSO,
32 Susan Avenue, Midland Park, New Jersey, having
been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
MS. HERLIHY: Thank you.
MS. ROSSO: Okay, bear with me.
My name is Helene Rosso. And I'm a
Midland Park resident for 17 years. I came here tonight to show my support for Taco Bell -- for the Taco Bell application.

I support it for multiple reasons, but some more than others. Bear with me.

Ever since my kids started school 14
years ago, I have been an active member in our community. I have served on many boards. I've coached. I'm a Girl Scout leader and much more.

And I'm telling you this because I've
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On Midland Park residents' Facebook
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dedicated the past 14 years to our community, especially the children and those less fortunate.

If this application is approved, it could open up 20 to 30 well-paying jobs for our teenagers and other members in our community.

In this day and age, I don't see how we would pass that up. Who knows when we'll get this opportunity again.

Also, we have a lot of young families in town with multiple children and both parents working.

Our community is very active with sports, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, theater, band and so on. And parents sometimes need fast food, you know.
I mean, are we going to give it to our kids every night? No. But Taco Bell has healthier options. They do have vegetarian options. They have -- I checked out the menu. They have gluten-free options. They have options that Wendy's and Burger King don't have, you know. It will give us parents another option when we need that quick meal on the go.

I mean, I have a vegetarian in my family, and a gluten-sensitive child, so I know what that's like. Okay?
page -- I don't know if any of you are on it -- but there are a lot of residents who are in support of this.

But unless you come to a Zoning Board meeting, there's no other way to express how you feel unless on social media.

Earlier this week I had sent an e-mail to Jessica, and I asked her to forward it to the board.

She explained to me that she couldn't do that, clearly. And I understood why. After I read the explanation, it made sense, you know, so... But, unfortunately, people work. People are busy. These meetings are long. I had no idea I would be here. I came straight from work. You know, people are busy. They're running their kids around. And this is a very common time for other organizations to meet. I mean, I've had two meetings this week already at 7 o'clock.

So there's conflicts that prohibit people from attending.

So I'm just asking you when you make your decision to please consider the community as a whole, because there's lot of people in the community that do want this, you know. I could show you my
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Facebook, you know, feed if you want.
But in look how long Friendly's stayed unoccupied and vacant. It was an eyesore that we passed for years, you know, so...

And as far as Burger King, I really -that was -- I didn't -- I don't understand all that stuff, but... And I don't know if the owner of Burger King lives in town, or the attorney or not. But how could they, like, come here and tell us what's good for our community? It just seems like they don't want the competition across the street. I mean, really. It's apples and oranges. They're two completely different things.

And, you know, so I just think that's ridiculous that they have the audacity to tell us what's good for our community.

And as far as the aesthetics of how it's going to look on the street, I don't know if anyone's seen a newer Taco Bell. They're actually really nice. You know, the building is really nice. It's better than, you know, having a building that's, like, abandoned and not in use. They'll construct the area, clean it up. I mean, that's the one big thing. I'm a Girl Scout leader for 14 years. We try to better our community, and literally by beautifying
it, you know. That's what we do, make the world a better place, you know.

And that's pretty much it. I want to
thank you for giving me -- oh, no. And I think that is, like, the perfect location because that's where all the other ones are.

So if I have to run to CVS to get a
pharm -- like, a scrip, I can go there, get dinner and, you know, most of us are buying two or three different things for our kids to eat, you know.

So I really do believe -- you know, I
hope you -- I hope you pass it.
I hope you vote yes for them because who knows when we'll get another prospect that will come and have the money to construct the area.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Helene. Helene, just so you understand what -- we're not -- we're not here to decide whether this is a good idea or not.

MS. ROSSO: No.
I understand that.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Taco Bell or whatever. There is -- there is an ordinance.

MS. ROSSO: And I think you should let that ordinance go out the window.
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us.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: That's not up to

MS. ROSSO: I know. I know. It's the
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variance.
In other words, we have ordinances -- I
don't if you were here for the first application --
MS. ROSSO: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: -- where they had a
front yard variance, whatever bulk variances.
MS. ROSSO: Right.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It's a completely
different standard of proof for a use variance.
MS. ROSSO: Right.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: It's very -- it's
very difficult on the applicant to prove that they're entitled to a use variance.

MS. ROSSO: I get it.
No, I understand your end, the legal
end.
But my end is, like, it's going to just better our community.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You'd like it.
MS. ROSSO: So I don't really, you
know.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right. Okay, thank you.

Anybody else?
MS. ROSSO: Thank you.
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MR. ROSSO: Hello.
A. J. Rosso, 32 Susan Avenue. That was my wife. So hand up.

MR. PLACIER: Tough act to follow.
MS. HERLIHY: Do you swear that the testimony you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. ROSSO: I do.
A. J. R O S S O,

32 Susan Avenue, Midland Park, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. ROSSO: And that was my wife.
MS. HERLIHY: In my notes I'm going to write Helene's husband.

MR. ROSSO: So please pass it, because if you don't, I'm going -- that's okay so...

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: But what about me. Am I going to get egged?

MR. ROSSO: We'll talk about that --
we'll talk about that after.
This is the first time I've ever gone to a meeting like this, and it won't be the last.

I'm a high school history teacher for over 20 years. I thought that was stressful, right.
But now I look at it and it's like, okay, this
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happened in the past. How are we leaving now? Let's speculate in the future. I'm never going to complain about work again.

You know, it really is interesting to see how this happens, this process that takes place. And I get the process on your end. And you have to hear our end, too. Because, like, hopefully we can kind of work together. You speak for the community. But it's difficult, like my wife said, people getting here. You know, we have been listening to people on Facebook and talking to people. And it is overwhelmingly yes.

But, again, if they're not here, we get
it.
And I know it's difficult to be in this position. And, hopefully, by listening to us say we're in favor of it, for a multitude of reasons, it could possibly help you make that decision inevitably you'll make. You know, there's a lot of money for the company to just get here, they've spent. And these are the types of companies, I think, that can afford to go in and put the money in and tear down and build up and get rid of the abandoned building.
I don't think you're going to get other smaller companies.
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You know, you need the bigger ones that have the money, that can pay the taxes. Not to mention the fact that they bring in jobs.

And the one thing that really stood out is, like, that -- that options thing. And, you know, listening to what they were talking about with Burger King, like, it did kind of feel like that they were taking, like, a choice away.

Like, it just seemed like -- I know there were all kinds of stuff that was going on there. But it just felt like they were saying they don't want to give us this choice because of the competition factor. You know, that makes sense, too.

But, you know, in a capitalist system, a choice, like, it seemed to be like it was just them saying to us, we know what's better for you. It just didn't feel -- it didn't feel right. It didn't sit right.

You know, and as far as the options thing, like, I remember driving my kids and their friends from one practice to another. You know, after 17 practices in two days and game after game and, yeah, this idea of having an option is reality. It's not every night. Of course it's not.
weekends, it would be nice to have that other option.
And it's not taking away from the other ones that are there. I think it would just give us more options as a community.

And, you know, like, if a company wants
to invest in our town -- which I love our town, I do.
I think we should -- we should let them do that.
Again, I know on your end it's not that simple. But on our end, that's how we see it.

And, you know, like, when I say our end, I'm talking about the over 100 people that we've seen and talked to and heard from that are saying the same thing that we're saying here tonight.

But again, it's fascinating. And I
don't know if they're all like this.
But, you know, I'll be at the next one.
I might not have anything to say, but I'll be at the
next one. It's really interesting.
So thank you. Thank you for what you do.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Thank you.
Anybody else?
(No Response.)
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No?
Going once?
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MS. ROSSO: Can I just make one more comment?

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Sure.
MS. ROSSO: Do I have to come back up?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
MS. ROSSO: Maybe it's a comment -- a
question. Isn't Starbucks a single drive-through lane? It is.

MS. HERLIHY: I believe.
MS. ROSSO: That's another thing.
There was a lot of opposition with Dunkin' Donuts there. And I never see traffic. I pass it every day, you know.

So I thought it was a single drive-through. I just wanted to double check that.

MS. CIERI: I do have a question.
Is that allowed?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Sure.
Come on up.
MS. CIERI: I'm just curious.
MS. HERLIHY: You need to give your name and address.

MS. CIERI: Nicole Cieri, 3 Hillside Avenue, Midland Park.

I just have a quick question. I
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listened to both sides. I'm a little scared of him. I'll never go against him.

So wasn't this really based on just opinion and no facts?

So hearing and listening to both -- and it was very entertaining, it was -- I just felt like she was just giving all opinion and he was giving all facts.

So I feel like if you can pass Starbucks, you should pass Taco Bell.

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: First of all, we will figure out what's facts and what's opinion.

MS. CIERI: I just feel like it was a lot of --

CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: But this is completely different than Starbucks.

MS. HERLIHY: Starbucks was at the Planning Board, is my understanding, even though I was not here. Starbucks was at the Planning Board.

So the difference is, when an application is -- Les described it earlier. There's different types of variances.

Any business that wants to go in and anybody that wants to develop a particular property -- I'm going to give a little land use history, a
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Any business that wants to go in and develop a property needs what's called site plan approval. They've got to go in and they've got to show you where they're going to put their building, where they're going to put parking. And they may need variances. There's different types of variances.
There are what we call $C$ variances, bulk variances. Like, too close to the side, too close to the front, too high. You know, those variances require certain proofs. And the Planning Board handles those. The Planning Board does site plan approval and C variances.

If the application needs what's called a use variance, that's a variance that's not -doesn't have to do with the size of the lot or the location of the structures, but it has to do with how the property is used, that's considered -- I'm not going to say it's a more important variance, but it's a different type of variance. It requires different proofs.

MS. CIERI: And Starbucks did not need that?

MS. HERLIHY: Did not need it.
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little bit. that

Different proofs, but more proof, and also a different vote.

A C variance requires just a majority.
If there are -- there's seven members of this board.
So if all seven members are here, a C variance requires four out of -- four out of seven.

If five members show up on a particular night, it requires three out of five.

A use variance, like this applicant requires --

MS. CIERI: Requires everybody.
MS. HERLIHY: -- requires five affirmative votes.

So if seven people are here, they need
five.
If five people are here, they need
five.
So it's more difficult and just a bit more complicated to obtain. It's not impossible.

But just with everybody comparing
Dunkin' Donuts went in, Starbucks went in. They were at the Planning Board. They didn't need the same type of variance. They didn't have the ordinance that prohibited drive-through restaurants.

MS. CIERI: Okay.
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MS. HERLIHY: That ordinance came after
that.
Many would tell you as result of that.
So that Planning Board, this board,
nobody had to deal with the fact that the
drive-through wasn't -- a restaurant wasn't permitted.

So this is a new animal, so to speak, what we're dealing with.

MS. CIERI: Okay. Well, that being said, I do understand that. I'm just saying that looking at an abandoned building --

MS. HERLIHY: Understood.
MS. CIERI: -- and the value that it brings, and the jobs it offers to our college kids or our high school kids, brings so much more value than denying it.

And as far as the menu sign, and how bright it's going to be, and that it talks to you, they all do. I mean, I'm just...

MS. HERLIHY: And, for the record, those types of variances are C variances. There's a lesser standard. It's a tougher climb for the applicant.

MS. CIERI: I do understand that.
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But some of the information was a
little bit, you know, silly.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Okay.
Anybody else?
MR. USHERENKO: Hi.
My name is Stan Usherenko. I moved my
family here. Two kids.
MS. HERLIHY: One second. Can you spell your last name.

MR. USHERENKO: U-S-H-E-R-E-N-K-O.
MS. HERLIHY: And your address.
MR. USHERENKO: 417 Prospect Street.
MS. HERLIHY: I need you to -- do you
swear that the testimony you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. USHERENKO: Absolutely.
STAN USHERENKO, 417 Prospect Street, Midland Park, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MS. HERLIHY: Thank you.
MR. USHERENKO: So, yeah, I moved here during the height of COVID with my wife and two kids in 2020, end of May. We love the town.

So I know you have the ordinance.
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One question I do have is, are you not allowed to go against that ordinance even the Mayor -- or can exceptions be made?

MS. HERLIHY: So that's why they're here.

So when -- you're not -- you can't go -- you know, you can't violate an ordinance. You can't vary from an ordinance. You come here for looking for relief or permission to vary from the ordinance.

So the applicant has the burden of providing testimony and evidence to prove why they're while entitled to vary. And it's not -- it's not completely subjective. It's not just they need to convince us that it's a better idea -- I shouldn't say us. I don't vote. That they -- forgive ne. That convince the board that it's a better idea than what the ordinance says. There's laws. There's -you know, there's a statute and there's case law that both Ms. Holmqvist and our planner have, you know, talked about that says the types of information that they have to provide, the types of proof they have to provide. They have to, kind of, check certain boxes in order to be entitled to the variance. It's really not just that everybody seems to think it's a good
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idea. That's -- it's not that subjective.
MR. USHERENKO: I know it was passed in 2021.

How can that be overturned if it had to be overturned?

MS. HERLIHY: That would be up to the
Mayor and Council. They adopt ordinances.
MR. USHERENKO: So we're allowed to contact them if we need to?

I'm just curious what the rationale
was. That goes opposite. Especially during COVID,
it was a plus to go through a drive-through.
The fact that you're actually taking
that option away from people is just surprising me, from a safety aspect.

Also, in terms of the parking lot, I
think that's much safer because a lot of times I go through a drive-through, go through a main street. This is isolated in the corner. And that main crosswalk, it's not even going over.

So in terms of a safety thing, it's actually safer than most drive-throughs.

And again, options, like A. J. was
saying, like, when I go to a drive-through, if I want
to go out with my kids, park, go inside, I actually
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like it because everybody's in the drive-through. I go inside. There's no line.

So I'm happy. They're happy.
It's raining. And there's also
families, they don't want to get out of the car. And
it's actually not as safe for them to get out of the
car, walk around the parking lot with their kids.
So, again, I think everybody's already
said all the pros. Just the question is, how can we overturn that if it had to be overturned?

But I'm definitely for it obviously.
And thank you for your time.
I appreciate it.
MR. FORMICOLA: There's a Council
meeting this Thursday.
MR. USHERENKO: Oh, is there?
MR. FORMICOLA: Go there.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: You're going to get in trouble, Rich.

VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Eight
o'clock, Thursday night, right here.
MR. FORMICOLA: Come on down.
MR. USHERENKO: I would love to hear
more.
Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: All right.
Anybody else in the public have
anything to add?
(No Response.)
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Anything to tell
us?
(No Response.)
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: No?
Seeing no one, motion to close.
MR. DIVAK: So moved.
MR. FORMICOLA: Second.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Zuidema?
MR. ZUIDEMA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Formicola?
MR. FORMICOLA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Papapietro?
VICE CHAIRMAN PAPAPIETRO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Placier?
MR. PLACIER: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Eliya?
MR. ELIYA: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Capalbo?
MR. CAPALBO: Yes.
MS. HARMON: Mr. Anderson?
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Yes.
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So next month we'll hear Mr. Whitaker's summation.

MR. WHITAKER: We'll have seven.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: Seven people, yeah.
MR. WHITAKER: Everybody will be here.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: As far as we know.
MR. WHITAKER: If that were to change,
I'd just ask that Jessica tell me.
CHAIRMAN ANDERSON: We have -- well, we should have nine, but we have eight.

MR. WHITAKER: Thank you very much for your time this evening.
(Whereupon, this matter is continuing at a future date. Time noted: 9:55 p.m.)
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